



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,827	01/26/2004	Philip Stephen Smith	PA0958.ap.US	6900

7590 12/13/2006

Mark A. Litman & Associates, P.A.
3209 West 76th St.
Suite 205
York Business Center
Edina, MN 55435

EXAMINER

HSU, RYAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3714

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/764,827

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan Hsu

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/10/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In response to the amendments filed on 9/29/06, claims 1-4, 14, 16-18, 20-26, and 31 have been amended and claim 41 has been newly added. Claims 1-41 are pending in the current application. With respect to claims 22-25, the limitation change to “having its own local processor that executes code” overcomes the indefinite rejection and the Examiner has retracted the 35 USC 112 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-24, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (US 6,607,443 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 22, and 41, Miyamoto discloses an automated gaming system comprising a gaming table and an upright video display panel comprising: (a) an upright video display panel, the panel displaying a virtual image of a dealer (*see Fig. 7 and the related description thereof*); (b) a table having an upper surface, the upper surface having a substantially horizontal video display surface that provides a continuous field of video display and at least two different player positions (*see elements [10-12] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*); (c) at least one player position having at least one local processor dedicated to the at least one player

Art Unit: 3714

position that is capable of executing code (*see sub-cpu [204] and main cpu [201] of Fig. 15 and the related description thereof*) and (d) at least one main game processor and optionally at least one additional game display processor in information communication with the upright video display panel and the video display surface, the main processor or at least one display processor directing video display on both the upright video display panel and the video display surface, and the main game processor providing game rules for the play of at least one casino table card game without the use of physical cards on the table (*see Fig. 3-4 and the related description thereof*). Additionally, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system that comprises a plurality of player stations, each player station having its own manufactured intelligence, which is a processor that executes code (*see col. 14: ln 4-49*).

Regarding claim 2, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein each player position has an individual player processing board that is capable of executing code and is dedicated to that position (*see Figs. 9, 13 and the related description thereof, col. 2: ln 41-64*).

Regarding claim 3, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein each individual player processing board that executes code will also communicate directly with the main game processor (*see col. 2: ln 41-64, sub-cpu and main cpu interaction of Fig. 15 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claims 4-5, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein each individual player processing board communicates directly with a single Dealer game engine processor or communicates directly with the display processor (*see col. 4: ln 17-35*).

Regarding claims 7-10, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein the video display surface has changeable light filtering that can screen displayed images from various angles (*ie:*

Art Unit: 3714

video display is capable of being controlled to change alter the pixels and may be viewed from various angles) (see display [7] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof, col. 5: ln 1-54).

Additionally, Miyamoto discloses a system wherein the light filtering can be changed upon command by a processor or by an external command. Furthermore, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein player input is provided at least in part by controls in the video display surface (*see Fig. 13 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 11, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein the controls comprise touch screen controls (*see Fig. 13 and the related description thereof, col. 14: ln 16-49*).

Regarding claim 12, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein the controls comprise a panel embedded into the video display surface (*see Fig. 19(a-b) and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claims 13-15, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein additional player input can be provided from player input or player controls provided on a surface below the video display surface and facing a position where players are to be seated (*see Fig. 20 and 23 and the respective related description thereof, element [401(a-c)] of Fig. 24 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claims 16-19 and 21, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein communication between the main game processor and each local processor is performed through a transaction-based protocol (*see col. 15: ln 25-50*). Additionally, Miyamoto discloses a system wherein either the main game processor or local processing board can start a transaction (*see CPU block [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 20, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein each player position has a local processor comprising an individual player processing board dedicated to that position and communication between the main game processor and the individual player processor is performed through a transaction-based protocol (*ie: the play of the game is based upon certain conditions and input/output responses made by the player or game program*)(*see col. 15: ln 25-50*).

Regarding claim 23, Miyamoto discloses a device wherein each player station and the main game processor are in communication (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 24, Miyamoto discloses a device wherein the communication is event driven (*ie: a processor controls the actions of the game when different inputs are received to advance a game*) (*see col. 15: ln 25-50*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (US 6,607,443 B1) in further view of Matsumoto et al. (US 5,497,461 A).

Regarding claim 26, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system comprising a gaming table and an upright video display panel comprising: (a) an upright video display panel, the panel

Art Unit: 3714

displaying a virtual image of a dealer (*see Fig. 7 and the related description thereof*); (b) a table having an upper surface, the upper surface having a substantially horizontal video display surface that provides a continuous field of video display and at least two different player positions (*see elements [10-12] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*), each player position having an intelligent board that executes code; and (c) at least one main game processor and optionally at least one additional game display processor in information communication with the upright video display panel and the video display surface, the main processor or at least one display processor directing video display on both the upright video display panel and the video display surface, and the main game processor providing game rules for the play of at least one casino table card game without the use of physical cards on the table (*see Fig. 3-4 and the related description thereof*); (d) wherein the intelligent boards are in communication with the main game processor, sending packets of information from player positions as events occur (*see col. 14: ln 4-49*). However, Miyamoto is silent with regard to incorporating sending the information in the form of packets. However, in the network arts it is inherent to establish a protocol in which communication between two processors or devices may occur in a system. One of the most common ways is using network packet that encapsulates information in a way that is consistent and accurate and therefore the data will properly reach its destination. In a related gaming patent, Matsumoto et al. teaches the implementation of monitoring packet information while transmitting data from one processor to another (*see Fig. 11 and the related description thereof*). Matsumoto teaches the implementation of packets to allow several different processors to know when the information received is for them to act upon (*see Fig. 12 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate such a feature in order to allow for distributed computing

Art Unit: 3714

to occur which would allow for several processors to communicate with one another. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the time the invention was made to incorporate a packet system to send information from the main processor to the player station at the time the invention was made.

Regarding claim 27, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein the communication between the intelligent boards and the main game processor comprises communication of player input (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 28, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein there is a dealer game engine intermediate the intelligent boards and the main game processor (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 29, Miyamoto discloses a gaming system wherein there is a direct line of communication between the intelligent boards and the main game processor for communication of player input (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 31, Miyamoto teaches a method of playing an automated game having an upright video display panel, the panel displaying a virtual image of a dealer (*see Fig. 7 and the related description thereof*), a table having an upper surface, the upper surface having a substantially horizontal video display surface that provides a common video display viewable from all player positions and at least two different player positions, each of the at least two player positions having an intelligent board (*see elements [10-12] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*), and a main game processor, the method comprising sending information from intelligent boards that executes code at player positions to the main game processor as

Art Unit: 3714

events occurs at player positions (*see Fig. 3-4 and the related description thereof*). However, Miyamoto is silent with regard to incorporating sending the information in the form of packets. However, in the network arts it is inherent to the art to establish a protocol in which communication between two processors or devices may occur in a system. One of the most common ways is using a network packet that encapsulates the information in a way that is consistent and accurate and therefore the data will properly reach its destination. In a related gaming patent, Matsumoto et al. teaches the implementation of monitoring packet information while transmitting data from one processor to another (*see Fig. 11 and the related description thereof*). Matsumoto teaches the implementation of packets to allow several different processors to know when the information received is for them to act upon (*see Fig. 12 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate such a feature in order to allow for distributed computing to occur which would allow for several processors to communicate with one another. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the time the invention was made to incorporate a packet system to send information from the main processor to the player station at the time the invention was made.

Regarding claim 32, Miyamoto teaches a method wherein player input initiates the communication between the intelligent boards and main game processor (*ie: the player input initiates play of the game through a wager; see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 33, Miyamoto teaches a method wherein there is a dealer game engine intermediate the communication path between the intelligent boards and the main game processor (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claim 34, Miyamoto teaches a method wherein the packets of information are sent directly from the intelligence boards from the intelligence boards to the main game processor for communication of player input (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*).

Regarding claims 35 and 38, Miyamoto teaches a method wherein the communication is event driven (*ie: a processor controls the actions of the game when different inputs are received to advance a game*) (*see col. 15: ln 25-50*).

Regarding claim 36 and 39, Miyamoto teaches a method wherein the communication comprises a cyclic redundancy check (*see CPU [20] and player terminal [10] of Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*). Miyamoto is silent with regard to the communication comprising a cyclic redundancy check. However Miyamoto teaches a system that incorporates communication between a CPU and a player station. It is an inherent problem in the networking field that information can be lost transferring from one point to another. One of the solutions is a cyclic redundancy check that allows the data integrity to be checked and validated. The incorporation of a cyclic redundancy check into a communication is old and well known in the art of communication systems and would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate in order to protect and check the data being transferred within the system.

Regarding claim 37 and 40, Miyamoto teaches a method wherein the communication is transaction based (*ie: the play of the game is based upon certain conditions and input/output responses made by the player or game program*)(*see col. 15: ln 25-50*).

Regarding claims 25 and 30, Miyamoto teaches a device wherein information communicated is included in an information packet (*see Fig. 4 and the related description thereof*). However, at the time the invention was made it is old and well known in the communication arts to formulate information packets in order to transfer information. It would not be possible to transfer data from one device to another without a protocol such as a packet to transport the data. Therefore as taught by Matsumoto above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of packets while transferring data from one processor with the system of Miyamoto in order to communicate with the intelligent boards.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant's representative contends that the prior art of Miyamoto lacks in disclosing any type disclosure or teaching of the applicant's "manufactured intelligence". Although the applicant's opinions have been noted and fully considered, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The term of contention the applicant's representative has stated in the remarks is that intelligence is defined as "**the ability to execute code**". If this is the definition of the applicant's intelligence in their invention then it can be defined as any processor or any processing component in modern computing systems. It is an inherent property in modern processors to accept signals or execute code in the form of software or hardware circuits. If a processor did not have the ability to execute code or software or information from hardware circuits, then it would not be able to perform any operations. Therefore Miyamoto's system meets the criteria set form by the applicant's claims, since it provides a plurality of individual

Art Unit: 3714

terminals, which are in communication with a main CPU that processes the operations of the game and is in communication with the individual local processors (*ie: sub-CPU*) which handle the player input responses to allow the operation of the game to occur. By the definition of intelligence set forth above, all processors disclosed and taught in Miyamoto inherently have the ability to execute code, since they are responsible for the processing of a game program in order to operate a game. Additionally, Examiner also directs the applicant's representative to independent claims 1, 22, 26, and 41, which have been examined as apparatus claims. The prior art of record, Miyamoto operates and performs a game with a video display and a plurality of player terminals. The contention that the processors do not have manufactured intelligence (*ie: ability to execute code*) is a moot point since the processors of Miyamoto are still capable of having manufactured intelligence and therefore anticipate the instant invention (*see MPEP 2112, In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d at 1478, 44 USPQ2d at 1432*). Finally, the applicant's representative attacks that Miyamoto's player terminal processor little more than 'button' functions, such that when stimulated an electrical signal is sent. However, the invention of Miyamoto is able to sense the movements and desired operations of a player. The applicant's representative is correct in the fact that signals are sent from the input/output devices, however, they are then collected and processed in order to cause an effect in the game program. By the definition set forth by the applicant's representative "the ability to execute code" these processors translate the signals and then translate the information into the game which would require using code to communicate between the hardware signals and the game program. However, the Examiner directs the applicant to its own contradiction that Miyamoto fails to meet the criteria set forth by the claim limitations. In applicant's own specification intelligence is described as "the ability to

Art Unit: 3714

execute code, either provided in the form of software or hardware circuits. Such processing may at least comprise some of signal converting (e.g., signals from player card readers, credit deposit, currency readers, coin readers, touch screen signals, control panel signals) into a signal that can be included in an information packet and interpreted by the main game computer when the signal is sent". Miyamoto meets this criteria by using "recognition circuits" to translate the information into command or response that is useable in the game program.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sines et al. (US 6,270,404 B2) - Automated System for Playing Live Casino Table Games Having Tabletop Changeable Playing Card Displays and Play Monitoring Security Features.

Kaneko et al. (US 5,879,235 A) – Ball Game Machine with a Roulette-Type Rotary Disk and a Display Located in the Central Area Therein.

Ikeda et al. (US 5,976,019 A) – Running Simulation Apparatus.

Nagao et al. (US 6,394,898 A) – Race Game Device.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3714

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Hsu whose telephone number is (571)272-7148. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 :00-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P. Olszewski can be reached on (571)272-6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



RH
December 06, 2006

SCOTT JONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER